

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-94 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office Action dated February 21, 2007, claims 1-89 were rejected and claims 90-94 were subject to a restriction requirement. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Applicants are canceling claims 11, 23-29, 51, 52, 60, 73, 74, 79, 84 and 89-94 without prejudice or disclaimer with this Amendment and Response. Applicants are amending claims 1, 12-14, 30, 40, 41-42, 44, 45, 53, 61, 62, 64, 65 and 85 in this Amendment and Response. Applicants are adding new claims 95-97. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

### **Election/Restriction**

Examiner states that claims 90-94 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed and constructively elects claims 1-89 for prosecution on the merits. Applicants confirm the constructive election of claims 1-89 and cancel claims 90-94 without prejudice or disclaimer.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 102(e) in View of Rukman**

Examiner rejects claims 23, 25-28, 51-52 and 74 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0185883 to Rukman (“Rukman”).

Applicants have canceled claims 23, 25-28, 51, 52 and 74, thereby obviating the basis for this rejection.

### **Response to Rejection Under § 35 USC 103(a) in View of Rukman and White**

Examiner rejects claims 1-15, 17-19, 21-22, 24, 30-45, 48-50, 53-63, 65, 68-73, 75-89 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Rukman and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0114174 to Walsh et al. (“Walsh”). This rejection is now traversed in light of the amended claims.

As amended, claim 1 recites:

A method for displaying a plurality of related SMS (Short Message Service) messages comprising:

reviewing a plurality of SMS messages associated with a first party;

determining whether to thread one or more SMS messages from the plurality of SMS messages into an SMS message thread by applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS message and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the one or more SMS messages also associated with a second party; and

outputting the SMS message thread. (emphasis added)

The claimed invention is a method for displaying related Short Message Service (SMS) messages as a message thread. Initially, a plurality of SMS messages associated with a first party are reviewed. A determination is then made whether to thread one or more SMS messages, also associated with a second party, from the plurality of SMS messages. To determine whether

to thread one or more SMS messages, a set of incoming SMS message rules are applied to incoming SMS messages and a set of outgoing SMS message rules are applied to outgoing SMS messages. The resulting SMS message thread is then output, allowing a user to view related SMS messages using the message thread.

By applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages and a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, the claimed invention allows for greater customization of thread generation and modification. The incoming SMS message rules determine the relationship between received SMS messages and prior SMS messages using different criteria, such as threading messages from known users or not threading messages from specified addresses. Similarly, the outgoing SMS message rules determine the relationship between transmitted SMS messages and prior SMS messages using various criteria, such as message arrival time, message destination or other suitable criteria. Hence, the claimed invention allows independent thread generation and modification of incoming and outgoing message threads by applying different threading rules to incoming and outgoing messages.

Rukman discloses identifying and organizing related messages using message text, such as a subject line. However, Rukman fails to disclose “applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages.” Rather, Rukman describes using a single parameter, such as subject text or message time to organize both incoming and outgoing messages. *See* Rukman, ¶ [0028], [0033]-[0034], [0047]. Accordingly, the technique disclosed in Rukman does not apply a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages and a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages, but merely uses a specified parameter to organize all messages, both incoming and outgoing. For example, Rukman uses the contents of the message subject

line (e.g., the number of times “RE:” appears in the subject line or a number in the subject line) to organize messages, regardless of whether the message is incoming or outgoing. *See* Rukman, ¶ [0047]. Hence, Rukman does not allow for application of separate message rules to incoming messages and outgoing messages.

Further, Walsh also does not disclose “applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages,” as recited in amended claim 1. Walsh discloses incorporating a message thread identifier into a message and using the thread identifier to determine a thread associated with the message. *See* Walsh, Abstract; ¶¶ [0005]-[0006]. Hence, Walsh uses the embedded thread identifier to organize messages and facilitate replying to previously received messages. Rather than apply a set of incoming SMS message rules and a set of outgoing SMS message rules to incoming and outgoing SMS messages, respectively, Walsh examines the embedded thread identifier in each message to determine message organization. As Walsh merely discloses embedding a thread identifier in each message, there is no disclosure of “applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages,” as recited in amended claim 1.

As to the dependent claims, because claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22 and 68-72 are dependent on claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22 and 68-72. Hence, claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22 and 68-72 are patentable over the cited reference.

Independent claim 30 has been similarly amended to recite “a threading rule database including a set of incoming SMS message rules applicable to incoming SMS messages and a set of outgoing SMS message rules applicable to outgoing SMS messages.” Independent claims 53

and 85 have been similarly amended to recite “applying a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS message and applying a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages.” Therefore, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are also applicable to claims 30, 53 and 85. Hence, claims 30, 53 and 85 are patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 31-45, 48-50 and 75-78 depend from claim 30, so all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 31-45, 48-50 and 75-78. Hence claims 31-45, 48-50 and 75-78 are patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 54-59, 61-63, 65 and 80-83 depend from claim 53, so all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated to as to apply to claims 54-59, 61-63, 65 and 80-83. Hence, claims 54-59, 61-63, 65 and 80-83 are patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 86-88 depend from claim 85, so all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 86-88. Hence, claims 86-88 are patentable over the cited reference.

As for claims 11, 24, 60, 73, 79, 84 and 89, Applicants have canceled these claims, thereby obviating the basis for this rejection.

Hence claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22, 30-45, 48-50, 53-59, 61-63, 65, 68-72, 75-68, 80-83 and 85-88 are patentable over the cited reference.

### **Response to Rejection Under § 35 USC 103(a) in View of Rukman, Walsh and Kraft**

Examiner rejects claims 16, 19, 46-47, 64 and 66-67 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Rukman and Walsh in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0006889 to Kraft (“Kraft”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As claims 16 and 19 depend from claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 16 and 19. As claims 46 and 47 depend from claim 30, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 30 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 46 and 47. As claims 64, 66 and 67 depend from claim 53, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 52 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 64, 66 and 67.

Kraft is cited to make up for the combination of Rukman and Walsh's failure to disclose "a rule to prevent expired SMS messages from being threaded," "displaying an icon in the SMS application to represent a threaded SMS" and "outputting the SMS message thread to an SMS application for display in a threaded format." However, Kraft discloses a method for handling a message exchange session where the message history, or a portion of the message history, is transmitted between terminals during the message exchange session. *See* Kraft, ¶¶ [0004]-[0005]. While the message exchange disclosed in Kraft maintains a history of exchanged messages, it does not apply "a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages" or apply "a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages." Hence, Kraft does not remedy the deficiencies of Rukman and Walsh.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claims 16, 19, 46, 47, 64, 66 and 67 are patentable over the cited references, both alone and in combination.

#### **Response to Rejection Under § 35 USC 103(a) in View of Rukman, Walsh and Kanefsky**

Examiner rejects claim 20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Rukman and Walsh in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,799,033 to Kanefsky ("Kanefsky"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As claim 20 depends from claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claim 20.

Kanefsky is cited to make up for the combination of Rukman and Walsh's failure to disclose "the SMS application is a network browser." However, Kanefsky discloses a mobile telephone text messaging device which displays static text from past messages and a message composition field for inputting text. *See* Kanefsky, col. 1, lines 47-65. The mobile telephone text messaging device disclosed in Kanefsky merely displays text from previous messages while a new message is composed and does not apply "a set of incoming SMS message rules to incoming SMS messages" or apply "a set of outgoing SMS message rules to outgoing SMS messages." Hence, Kraft does not remedy the deficiencies of Rukman and Walsh.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 20 is patentable over the cited references, both alone and in combination.

#### **Response to Rejection Under § 35 USC 103(a) in View of Rukman and Kraft**

Examiner rejects claim 29 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Rukman and Kraft.

Applicants have canceled claim 29, thereby obviating the basis for this rejection.

#### **Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-10, 12-22, 30-50, 53-59, 61-72, 75-78, 80-83, 85-88 and 95-97, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited

references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
RICHARD J. DONALD, DAVID L. WILLIAMS  
AND DAVID MATISKELLA

Date: June 19, 2007

By: /Brian G. Brannon/

Brian G. Brannon, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 57,219  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7610  
Fax: (650) 938-5200  
E-Mail: bbrannon@fenwick.com